

**Chehalis River Basin Flood Authority and  
Chehalis Basin Partnership**

**Joint Information Work Session  
Veterans Memorial Museum  
100 SW Veterans Way  
Chehalis, WA**

**May 25, 2010 – 9:00 A.M.  
Meeting Notes**

**1. Convene Work Session**

Mr. Bruce Mackey called the meeting to order at 9:03 A.M.

**2. Introductions**

Self-introductions were made by all attending

Mr. Mackey stated this is an informational meeting; no decisions will be made. The goal is a common understanding of the facts and concerns of all parties.

Mr. Mackey stated this meeting would be successful if people understand the issues and can go back to their group and have a discussion and at some point propose a future course of action regarding its participation in the GI.

**3. Without-Project Conditions Information**

Ms. Mona Thomason, Chief of Planning for the Corps, stated her job is policy compliance, quality control, and securing the necessary resources. When the Corps conducts a feasibility study it coordinates with all the stakeholders who have an interest in the project.

The Corps is involved in two efforts in the Chehalis Basin and has funding for two projects and they need to be kept separate. The first is the Twin Cities project, or levee project. It was authorized for construction in 2007 and its purpose is flood risk management and protecting lives and property in Centralia and Chehalis. It will improve old levees, build new levees and modify the Skookumchuck Dam. The feasibility study from 2003 is being updated since some information has changed because of the floods of 2007 and 2009. The project the Corps is authorized for will be built.

After initiating the Twin Cities project in 1998 the members of the Basin said they wanted to focus on eco system restoration and it has gone back and forth with flood risk management outside the Centralia/Chehalis area. We then initiated the basin study, or General Investigation.

The GI is in the feasibility phase. The Corps does not yet have authorization to construct anything in the basin. The feasibility study requires analysis and a determination of whether or not there is a project in which the Corps is interested in participating, and being funded by Congress. There must be a non-federal sponsor to share the cost and to maintain the project. The feasibility study determines the cost share for both the Corps and the non-federal sponsor. The Corps works with the non-federal sponsor and all stakeholders in the Basin.

If we are successful a project is authorized and we construct one or more projects. Currently Grays Harbor County is the sponsor of the feasibility study and it does not need to be the sponsor of a project that is constructed, although a sponsor is needed for construction. On the basin-wide study the Corps would expect multiple jurisdictions to step forward to sponsor design and the construction of various elements. The participants could be DOE, WDFW, the cities, etc. and we can have multiple sponsors in the design and construction phases.

Commissioner Averill stated the original GI started in 2000 with a focus on ecosystem restoration. Based on funding received in 2008, the Flood Authority started the process of talking about flood mitigation, the money was authorized and we had to make a decision to either give the money to Grays Harbor County to continue the existing GI for restoration or create a new GI to look at flood mitigation, or put them together. That is the process we are in today, which means a new Project Management Plan (PMP) which is the subject for discussion as well as how we divide up the money and responsibilities and the without project condition issue on water retention.

Mr. Chad Taylor stated he thought the issue was the \$24 million and 14 years before there is a project. Everyone in Lewis County supports water retention as a primary goal and the levees as secondary. This is too long a time and too much money and does not work for us. If it doesn't work, send it back to the drawing board.

Ms. Thomason stated doing a Corps study and project is neither cheap nor easy. The Twin Cities project, which focused on a small geographical area compared to the Basin, took from 1998 to 2004 to complete the study with the non-federal sponsor doing about \$6.5 million work and the Corps did another \$6.5 million. When we talk a Basin study with two purposes you need to expect that it will cost more. Before Congress authorizes a project we need to know what project we are moving to construction. The bar is very high for the level of detail by both the Corps and the Office of Management and Budget and Congress. Generally the Corps authorizes very expensive projects. The Twin Cities project costs \$124 million.

Mr. Taylor stated it is okay to spend the money but it's too long and it's not the right project. Chehalis is not going to buy off on this project, and who is going to have that kind of money?

Commissioner Schulte stated most General Investigations take three years to complete and the Corps has already been working on this for years.

Mr. Mackey reiterated that we are here to engage in a discussion with everyone about what the Corps is laying out and for people to understand the process and you can take the issues back to your group or jurisdiction.

Mr. Rene Remund stated a year ago there was discussion of determining the feasibility of water retention and it was decided it would be quicker to do it as part of the GI study. The minutes of that meeting state there is a recently approved budget which includes ecosystem restoration and flood reduction. The reports states that most General Investigations take three years to complete. Option 3 is a separate agreement with the Corps and Counties would not be viable because it would take 6 months and the Corps indicated it would be timely to go with the second option which is to combine both plans. Now the GI study stated it will be 14 years and \$24 million. One Voice gave strong support to the GI study because it would be quicker to go forward. Discussing the interlocal agreement of the PMP is

putting the cart before the horse. You must agree on a goal first and if there is no agreement then the operating instructions are not going to work. People are faced with personal injury and death and this length of time is not supportive of that. The constituency says they do not want the long plan.

Ms. Thomason stated the \$14 million study is to determine what projects to recommend for flood risk management and ecosystem restoration. The Corps has heard this is the wrong project but the \$14 million is to figure out the right project.

The Corps can only work as fast as appropriations come from Congress. We have been getting up to \$1 million, and assuming we get the maximum, it would still take 12 years. The time is in relation to how long it will take to get those funds. If you need to talk about that we need to talk about the scope. We tried to develop a realistic plan and schedule and this is what we think it will take to get there.

Mr. Remund asked if the Corps can use sub contractors who can go on a shorter time span. Ms. Thomason stated they do not meet the needs we have but we can use information supplied by other sources.

Commissioner Willis stated there is a relationship between the money and the timeline. If the money is appropriated right away would the timeline become shorter? Mr. Goss stated to some extent; if you get more funding you can shorten the design time.

Ms. Thomason stated there is some sequential work that needs to be done and we are trying to give you a realistic schedule. If it costs \$12 million the 14 years is pretty aggressive.

Commissioner Averill stated that the suggestion that the Corps has not been funded is inaccurate. The 2009-2010 appropriation means you already have \$1.5 million and the current marker for 2011 is \$1 million on the House side. The Senate has always doubled the House money. The money is coming to do the project.

He continued by asking why the projects must start all over again. The eco system portion started in 2000 and he agrees that it bogged down in 2003 due to lack of funding but we have already done three years of studies plus Grays Harbor and the Chehalis Basin Partnership have time and studies in that project. It appears that in the process of starting over again we are starting at zero.

Mr. Sean Murphy stated we know what the Corps is responsible for doing. He asked if there is something similar for the GI study: to review what you are tasked with in completing this project to better understand the 14 year outlook.

Ms. Kristen Kerns stated the Corps developed the PMP prior to the two without project scenarios and associated with that is a detailed schedule which outlines every activity, review and time associated with those activities.

Mr. Murphy stated the plan to develop the GI is assuming the Twin Cities project is built. What is the time frame for that? Ms. Kerns stated about 12 years. Mr. Murphy asked if that will be available to the group to see what the plan looks like. Mr. Goss stated it went out with the draft PMP.

Ms. Thomason stated the Corps cannot initiate a timeline until the PMP is signed.

Commissioner Schulte stated we are not going to sign a 14-year study. That is an unacceptable solution.

Ms. Thomason stated it is the leadership of the Corps that says that, too. The Deputy Assistant to the Secretary of the Corps thinks the feasibility study should be done in 18 months.

Mr. Remund stated we would like the opportunity to discuss who might assist you.

Ms. Thomason stated the Corps understands the concerns about the time and cost and the opposition; however some people want to understand the process of the without conditions.

Mr. Kahle Jennings stated the re-evaluation report and tables go back to 1931. A lot of these things have not been done for various reasons. There was a determination about 1982 for upstream storage and it was not economically feasible. How much do we need to re-evaluate that without doing the whole study over again?

Ms. Thomason stated when the GRR (General Reevaluation Report) was done we looked at retention and decided the information from 1982 was still valid and did not need to re-evaluate that.

Commissioner Averill stated at that point there was no concern about the upper basin because it had not flooded. Accounting for that, the Corps decided retention was not needed in the upper basin but the GI study is to look basin wide. What is the impact on not just the Twin Cities corridor but the entire corridor? He would argue that the earlier decision did not take in all the considerations.

Ms. Thomason stated all the benefits were considered, including the upper basin. We can look at it again on a cursory basis without spending a lot of money but if we are going to recommend a retention structure we need to do a detailed engineering, environmental and economic study.

Ms. Kerns stated part of the \$24 million reflects the analysis of a retention measure.

Commissioner Schulte asked what we get out of the \$12 million. Ms. Thomason stated there is an authorized project and we will use that information. The \$12 million is for the Twin Cities project and the \$24 million is additional money to spend, using information we have.

Mr. Mark White stated the levee project is what everyone wanted in the beginning. The Corps is doing what we asked them to do.

Mr. Taylor stated what changed everything was the 2007 flood and that maybe something else needed to be done and retention became important. Someone is responsible for half of the \$24 million and who will that be? If no one will pay for it why do we keep working on it?

Ms. Thomason stated we are attempting to respond to the non-federal sponsor. It will be hugely expensive and take a lot of time. If you don't want it we won't do it. We are only willing to do what the non-federal sponsor is willing to pay for.

Ms. Susan Rosback stated we want retention first and then levees. The money is not the biggest issue but time. If the Corps got \$10 million up front could you meet the criteria in three years? Can the study be shortened?

Mr. Goss stated it would need to be reviewed by several entities and there is the 65% and final design. If we had unlimited resources it would still take 10-12 years.

Ms. Kerns stated there is a linear process that needs to be processed and today we are looking at without project conditions. We must find different combinations to be met to come up with construction. We are looking at both ecosystem restoration and flood management and there is a unique opportunity to mesh these two together and offer the best solution. We must do all the reviews and outreach adds time. In terms of capability, this linear timeline takes 10 years. We can pull in other contractors but it will not shorten the study time. After the study is approved we will go into several years of design and implementation which is where we are at with the Twin Cities project right now.

Mr. Murphy stated although this will take 12 years to complete it will take shape much sooner than that as to the end results. In 3-4 years we will have an idea of where this is going, looking at water retention, ecosystems restorations, etc. With that said, the PMP can be updated. In 2-3 years we will see the direction it is going and can update the timeline and more discussions will take place.

Ms. Thomason stated on the non-federal side, there is a clause that allows the sponsor to terminate the study with 60 days notice.

Ms. Bonnie Canaday stated the citizens are going to flood for many more years before anything is completed. Every flood is different and that changes the studies. It is frustrating to the citizens.

Mr. Dave Muller stated feasibility is being confused with design. The Twin Cities project costs \$13 million and a lot of that is design, not feasibility. The timeframe for the basin-wide GI feasibility is 2-3 years. Let's do that part so the information is on the table.

Ms. Thomason stated the Corps should update that. Three years is our goal for a very small geographical project. She does not know of any feasibility study that is done in three years. That time frame is for one purpose, one small site. The reason we are having this discussion is because there is disagreement whether the Twin Cities project will be constructed and that matters as to what should be done for flood risk management and restoration if the Twin Cities project is in place. We are moving forward with the Twin Cities project so we need to assume the Twin Cities project will be constructed. We understand that there are jurisdictions that don't want the Twin Cities project and we can do an analysis if the Twin Cities project is not constructed and that issue will be addressed.

Ms. Kerns pointed out the board that illustrated the two without project conditions and referred to it during the PowerPoint. She explained the without project conditions which includes a planning process, an inventory of current conditions and forecasting the most likely conditions that are expected. Projections should be made for the environment, hydrology, hydraulic and socio economic characteristics. These serve as a foundation for which measures and alternatives are developed.

There will be two without project conditions developed: the scenario including construction of the currently authorized Twin Cities project and a scenario assuming no construction of the Twin Cities

project. Each without and future without project conditions must perform a complete inventory and forecast the two scenarios.

Commissioner Averill stated if there is no construction of the Twin Cities project how does the Corps do the Twin Cities project with only 35% done. Kristen stated the Corps has hydraulic modeling and it can update the future data in there. It will be simultaneous but we know what the Twin Cities project will do and protect.

Commissioner Averill stated the DOT claims modeling is one-dimensional. This may be a reason why we keep going back to the studies.

Ms. Thomason stated the hydraulic and hydrology models look at all various possibilities and probabilities of discharges and variables.

Mr. MacReynold asked if the modeling is for public information. Mr. Goss stated it will be available and it will include the last two floods and it is in the 35% design.

Ms. Kerns continued with the PowerPoint. She stated alternatives, like measures, will need to be developed separately for the without project conditions in order to address each individual scenario for the unique problems and opportunities of each.

Mr. Glen Connelly spoke of the two prongs of the study. If you are studying with the levees in place, as a measure would you look at levees around and re-studying the Twin Cities project?

Ms. Kerns stated there was federal interest in the Twin Cities project and when the analysis is done without the Twin Cities project in place we will look at the same measures and alternatives done in the GRR. That interest could be found again; there are no conditions because things have changed but we are obligated to look at the interest.

Commissioner Willis asked with the two projects and one including the Twin Cities project, does the cost analysis ever combine the GI and the Twin Cities project or are you doing the cost benefit separately.

Ms. Kerns stated for the Twin Cities project we have determined a positive benefit for the cost ratio. The Twin Cities project is protecting Chehalis and Centralia area and we don't need to worry about that any more. If we look at the Twin Cities project we don't need to account for benefits and costs so we will do an economic inventory of everything that is not protected. If you do the cost benefit with Twin Cities in place you will see fewer benefits and less damage because you already have something in place. Without the Twin Cities project there will be a larger inventory with no benefits.

Mr. MacReynold asked what the value is without the Twin Cities project.

Mr. Kerns stated the Corps has to justify the benefits outweighing the costs of the project. If you don't have the Twin Cities protecting Chehalis and Centralia there are more things to protect.

The question was asked about the cost of dams compared to the benefits.

Ms. Kerns stated ecosystems restoration cannot be used as mitigation so when the Corps builds levees it has to mitigate for environmental damage that has been done. Ecosystems restoration is a dual purpose of the GI: to build ecosystems restorations, not to make up for anything. We are going to improve the habitat out there that has not been damaged by our levee. With the dual purpose we will develop the ecosystems measure and flood risk management measures and when we get to a certainty of what they are we do a trade-off analysis to be sure they are compatible with each other.

Mr. Bruce Treichler stated, referring to habitat restoration and rehabilitation, there are other activities that reduce the need for built structures.

Ms. Kerns stated flood ways can be opened. The Corps will do an ecosystems restoration component that accounts for that.

Mr. Treichler stated his goal is to reduce the flood risk. If you have a habitat restoration how do you do that in the process of building a structure?

Ms. Kerns stated the Corps looks at the hydraulic nexus to make sure we have the best combination of all the components.

Mr. Paul Massart stated we can use non-structural methods instead of building a levee. Mr. Goss stated if we see storage potential we can plug those numbers into the model.

Ms. Thomason stated the Corps makes a determination of how certain it is that a project is constructed and having that project in place would be part of without project conditions and it would be treated the same if the structure is not in place. The Corps would do an analysis of the best thing to do and there will be dozens of alternatives. It would go through the H and H economic analysis with different alternatives to see what will give the most benefits for the money for the economics, environmental, etc. We may be willing to trade off economic benefits for flood mitigation benefits. We need to discover what the plan is that maximizes the net benefits and that will be the plan in the federal interest to implement and we will recommend it for funding participation.

Ms. Kerns continued with the PowerPoint and screening of measures and alternatives and the feasibility scoping meeting. The feasibility scoping meeting (FCM) is a mandatory policy checkpoint with Northwestern Division (NWD) and USACE headquarters.

Mr. Mackey asked, going back to Mr. Murphy's question about timing, if the Corps knows at what point in time this happens. Ms. Kerns stated it would be about 3 to 4 years for the FSM.

Prior to the FSM the uncertainty of the Twin Cities project being constructed will be evaluated. After evaluating uncertainties a without and future without project conditions scenario with associated measures and alternatives will be selected to move forward.

Ms. Thomason stated the project the Corps ultimately recommends will be based on different alternatives and without project conditions so the without project conditions is key to the ultimate decision. The purpose of the scoping meeting is to get concurrence with higher headquarters that we have captured the without project condition and the future without project conditions because the

project will ultimately be based on the without project conditions. It is a meeting within the Corps and we invite the non-federal sponsor and the stakeholders.

Mr. Carter stated the alternatives and measures are the same regardless: they will always be considered. When you get to the screening are those products of negotiation of what the screening will be with the sponsors?

Ms. Kerns stated the Corps solicits stakeholder input as to what they think is pertinent so it is a combination of the two. We will draw up alternatives and measures but must consider the whole range. Mr. Carter asked if this is a public process and Ms. Kerns stated it is.

Ms. Powe asked where the cost of mitigation fits into the cost ratio, especially for the Twin Cities project. We don't have any idea of what the mitigation will cost.

Ms. Kerns stated we will develop the mitigation as we get further along with design, which is 35%. We can factor in contingencies for that mitigation and when this is accounted for we have a positive cost benefit ratio. We had to update the mitigation plan with a more detailed plan and it will be available in September. We are doing it for the Twin Cities project and also for the feasibility study.

Ms. Kerns referred back to the board. After the feasibility scoping meeting there will be more analysis and screening to select a plan and recommend a plan. If a decision cannot be made we will look at a parallel plan and choose only one.

We must determine an acceptable level of uncertainty. We will look for the sponsor's commitment and the congressional commitment for funding. The Corps sees that as a certain path forward and that is why we are going forward with one without project conditions. Because there is local opposition perhaps the second scenario has to be added in and we will try to get a higher level of acceptability.

Mr. Mackey asked if that decision point is three to four years out. Ms. Kerns stated yes and if we can make it before that would be preferable but this is where we give a big effort to making the decision and presenting it at the FSM. If we are not able to make that decision we will continue on a parallel path. Cost and time would increase.

Mr. Mackey stated we will not have to wait 12 to 14 years; we will have a lot of information in three to four years.

Commissioner Averill asked for the without project #2 do you look at various types of water retention and are you going to look at different levels, such as a dam, a dam with water quality or with hydro?

Ms. Thomason stated we could look at it. When we do a study we do a flood risk management and ecosystems restoration project. Looking at retention structures we need to determine if the structure is in the federal interest with just the ecosystems restoration. The Corps is not authorized to do water quality so we will have to show that a retention structure is justified on the basis of flood risk management and ecosystems restorations benefits with it. If we want to look at hydro we can look at it and it would be 100% non-federally funded.

Commissioner Averill asked if the Corps works with the NRCS who does water quality. Ms. Thomason stated that is a federal agency with a different mission. The Corps can cooperate with them as it does with the EPA, WDFW, etc. If they are not part of the stakeholder team we could ask them.

Mr. MacReynold asked if the jurisdictions agree to the GI what happens if it is put on hold. Ms. Kerns stated the Corps has two projects and the Twin Cities project with 35% design will continue to move forward regardless of the GI. The GI needs to react to what the Twin Cities project is doing. The Twin Cities project is a congressionally authorized project.

There was discussion regarding the design and construction and funding for that. The funding is dependent on appropriations and real estate acquisitions and they will probably start moving dirt in 2016 for the Twin Cities project.

Mr. MacReynold asked if we choose to do retention the soonest 35% design is at least 14 years out. Ms. Kerns stated that is correct.

Mr. Murphy was concerned about the match. He asked what kind of money we are looking at for the local jurisdictions. Mr. Goss stated it would be a total of \$3 to 5 million, or half of that for a jurisdiction.

#### **4. Break**

The group recessed for ten minutes, reconvening at 11:05.

#### **5. Without-Project Conditions Discussion**

Mr. Mackey stated the discussion provided quite a bit of clarification on the Twin Cities project and the GI. The Corps will move forward with the GI with the assumption of the Twin Cities project in place and there is the option of a dual track to have it done with the Twin Cities project in place or not in place. We need a discussion about timing and costs and later discuss how to proceed.

#### **6. Project Management Plan**

Mr. Mackey stated we need to determine what kinds of studies non-federal sponsors could do. The Tribe, any county, the Flood Authority or the Chehalis Basin Partnership could participate in the GI as it moves forward. Grays Harbor County is the non federal sponsor so how could the other entities work with Grays Harbor County, especially if you want a match?

Ms. Kerns stated beginning with the without project analysis is a big part of the study that can take contributions from any stakeholder. Inventories of environmental conditions, data collections and surveys provide a lot of input and local entities have some of that data collected already.

Commissioner Willis asked if that is in the PMP and would it count as in-kind match.

Ms. Kerns stated data that is already collected is not considered for in-kind match but it lowers the cost because it is something the Corps will not have to do. If you can provide us with data collection or inventory and you want to provide in-kind services we will write up a memo or put it in into the PMP. That can contribute to the without project conditions. You can inventory wetlands, etc, but discuss that with us and we will determine the value of that.

Mr. Goss said look at measures and alternatives that are ahead of where we are. We can't do an evaluation on a measure as that measure may fall out. When we get to measures we can do an evaluation of technical criteria to see what counts as in-kind match. We cannot review what may count in the future.

Ms. Kerns stated you don't want to get too far ahead of the Corps without negotiations. If you want to build a flood wall you can talk to us but if we don't look at it as part of the federal plan it becomes null and void and is not useful to us. Negotiations are very important to in-kind.

Ms. Thomason stated the Corps can give in-kind credit for work we would otherwise have done if you had not done it and it has to be negotiated ahead of time. We have an agreement with GHC to give credit for work done. If anyone other than the GHC does the work there needs to be a legal agreement between those two entities.

Commissioner Averill stated the pace of the project is slow in our perspective. We wanted to know if water retention was feasible so we started looking at it. The study is eventually usable in the without project condition but it was done before we implemented the project.

Ms. Thomason stated we can use the data but we cannot give you the cost share.

Commissioner Averill stated we are putting together a group to look at biological conditions for water retention and impacts on fish. If we wait for you we might not be able to do this until next year and it needs to be done now and it will be critical to without conditions. This is a \$900,000 study and Commissioner Averill is reluctant to not have it count.

Mr. Murphy stated this is an important study and the Corps can use the data and make their process cheaper. Once the PMP is signed we can be sure everyone is credited appropriately.

Commissioner Averill reiterated what Mr. Jennings said regarding studies from the 1930's. There is data available to speed up the process.

Ms. Kerns stated the data that is available can be used but a lot has changed in the Basin since the 1930's: the 2007 flood for example. The economic development will change components and updates will need to occur. The data will be used.

Mr. MacReynold stated based on the Corps' timeline, if we can focus on retention the soonest for 35% design is 14 years. There is another 6-8 years of further design and then construction. It will be 20+ years before a retention facility can be built. That is our frustration and it is beyond our imagination. We might be better off saying no to everything the Corps is moving forward and see what else we can identify.

Ms. Kerns stated FERC and NEPA are all considered in the timeline. Ms. Thomason stated those have to be completed in order to get an approved feasibility report.

Ms. Canaday asked about construction on I-5 and how much will that change the flooding issues.

Mr. Donahue stated the portion of I-5 that goes through the Twin Cities project is not funded or designed at this time. There is a study to decide how I-5 might be expanded. Flooding impacts on I-5 awaits the Twin Cities project. The Mellen Street project will be built before the Twin Cities project.

There was discussion regarding the information received from Colonel Wright and the differences in the timeline for the project. Ms. Kerns stated seismic requirements are a new component that increased the analysis and the review process has been changed which will take longer.

Mr. Jennings stated the PMP should be modified with the existing ecosystems restorations project that was already authorized rather than getting authorization on a specific reservoir/levee combination. The ecosystem restoration component is potentially more extensive in a levee/retention situation.

A resident stated the river needs to be cleaned up because fish restoration cannot be conducted if the river goes over its banks all the time. She does not want to see a levee; it will not help west Lewis County.

Ms. Kerns stated services stakeholders can provide are data out-reach programs, and open houses can also be in-kind services that can be put into the PMP. Ms. Thomason stated there must be a detailed real estate plan and a non-federal sponsor can put that together and that would be another in-kind service. Anything that can be contracted out by the Corps can be contracted out by the non-federal sponsor or a partner.

Mr. White asked what if everyone in the Basin stopped changing the conditions. Ms. Kerns stated those are things that the Corps must address and updates must be made to the conditions.

Commissioner Averill stated building in the flood plain is central to Mr. White's question. The Flood Authority was formed to solve flooding in the basin and all we've done is spend money on studies. We are reaching a point of diminishing returns. We need to show some concrete constructive flood mitigation measures and if we can't do that with the Corps we need to look elsewhere. The only prospect so far is an improved early warning system.

Mr. Mackey asked the alternatives if the Corps work is not used.

Commissioner Averill suggested local mitigation as part of the freeway projects, which will require Corps approval but it will be quicker than a feasibility study. We looked at the smaller creeks and determined the Corps cannot support us on 205 and 206 will not provide enough protection for the damage the creeks create so we need another alternative – perhaps Trout Unlimited.

Commissioner Averill continued by stating that the Flood Authority was intended to be temporary until a flood district was created. Once the district is formed the Flood Authority's purpose is assumed by the District. The District will be a municipal corporation and will pick up sponsorship to raise taxes and funds. The current legislation requires that the District is formed by July 2011. At that time we will look at who our sponsors are and who is responsible for projects and how those projects can be supported. It will not, however, be a great deal of money because the population and tax base is limited.

Mr. Mackey stated the group today looked at #6 and #7 on the agenda and the Corps talked about the work that could be done. There is a lot of information to be gathered from the local jurisdictions which

would speed up the process but might not be eligible for a match. If the Corps contracts for work but a local entity does the work it would count for a match. In measures, studies could be used as a match. If an entity is looking for a match, come in early, negotiate and be sure you understand and work with the local sponsor for agreement.

Mr. Mackey stated the next step is to go back to the local jurisdictions and entities and decide how to proceed. If another meeting is necessary, let him or the Corps know and they will try to make it happen.

Ms. Thomason stated she will talk to Mr. Goss about the budget and schedule to see if it can be scrubbed to save time and costs. 14 years and \$24 million are too much and the Corps will look at it with no promises. The budget is based on the tasks that must be accomplished.

Mr. Mackey stated there needs to be an understanding of how these two projects work together and how the timing and decisions are made. Look at ways in which critical decisions can be made in 3-5 years rather than looking at 12 years. Help people understand those decisions and they will be more comfortable about the decisions that need to be made.

The PMP has not been signed because we needed to have this discussion. There needs to be a decision to move forward with the PMP without project conditions.

Commissioner Schulte suggested taking the PMP back to the drawing board because it will not work for Lewis County.

Mr. Mackey stated the Flood Authority and the Chehalis Basin Partnership thought they had a draft PMP with the Twin Cities project as part of the without project conditions. He asked if the PMP should be revisited and go down the dual path.

Ms. Powe stated the plan itself is fine; it's the numbers. Ms. Kerns stated the numbers in the PMP need to be agreed upon.

Ms. Canady stated everyone should get together again, hammer it out and sign it so we can move forward.

Mr. Mackey stated another meeting will be required and he will work on it. He thanked the Corps for attending.

## **8. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 11:52.